

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 815 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Gibbons	Northup
Akin	Gilchrest	Norwood
Alexander	Gillmor	Nunes
Bachus	Gingrey	Nussle
Baker	Gohmert	Osborne
Barrett (SC)	Otter	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Paul
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pearce
Bass	Green (WI)	Pence
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Biggart	Hall	Petri
Bilirakis	Harris	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Blunt	Hayes	Poe
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pombo
Boehner	Hefley	Porter
Bonilla	Herger	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Hoekstra	Putnam
Boozman	Hostettler	Radanovich
Boustany	Hulshof	Ramstad
Bradley (NH)	Hunter	Regula
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Rehberg
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Reichert
Ginny	Issa	Renzi
Burgess	Istook	Reynolds
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Camp (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Royce
Cantor	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Carter	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Castle	King (IA)	Schmidt
Chabot	King (NY)	Schwarz (MI)
Chocola	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kirk	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Kline	Shadegg
Conaway	Knollenberg	Shaw
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Shays
Cubin	Kuhl (NY)	Sherwood
Culberson	LaHood	Shimkus
Davis (KY)	Latham	Shuster
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Simmons
Davis, Tom	Leach	Simpson
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Dent	Linder	Sodrel
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Stearns
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Drake	E.	Sweeney
Dreier	Mack	Tancredo
Duncan	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	Marchant	Terry
Emerson	McCaul (TX)	Thomas
English (PA)	McCotter	Thornberry
Everett	McCrery	Tiahrt
Feeney	McHenry	Tiberi
Ferguson	McHugh	Turner
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McKeon	Upton
Flake	McMorris	Walden (OR)
Foley	Mica	Walsh
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Moran (KS)	Weller
Franks (AZ)	Murphy	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Musgrave	Whitfield
Gallegly	Myrick	
Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer	
Gerlach	Ney	

Wicker
Wilson (NM)

Wilson (SC)
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX)
Cleaver
Evans
Granger

Hensarling
Kennedy (RI)
Larson (CT)
Marshall

□ 1608

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2567

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 2567.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR FURTHER CONSID- ERATION OF H. CON. RES. 376, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-468) on the resolution (H. Res. 817) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 376) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5386, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRI- ATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-469) on the resolution (H. Res. 818) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5386) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSID- ERATION OF H. CON. RES. 376, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 817 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 817

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 376) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011. The amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Sec. 2. After adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 376, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 83 and to consider the Senate concurrent resolution in the House. All points of order against consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the resolving clause of the Senate concurrent resolution and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 376 as adopted by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, is adopted, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate concurrent resolution and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 817 is the rule that provides for debate on House Concurrent Resolution 376, which is the Federal budget, the bill that establishes the Federal spending priorities for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for the outyears in 2008 through 2011.

As a member of both the Rules Committee and someone who serves on the Budget Committee, I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor for the House's consideration. This rule makes in order three substitute amendments, three different viewpoints on the direction that Federal spending should take for the coming fiscal year.

Each of those will be debatable for 40 minutes. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution.

I come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, with a resolution that allows us to complete the debate and passage for the House budget resolution for fiscal year 2007. It is a work product over many, many weeks, beginning with Chairman NUSSLE and Ranking Member SPRATT in the Budget Committee, along with all of the Members of this House to bring it to fruition here today.

The resolution continues policies that have helped to continue a strong U.S. economy. We have included savings for working Americans with \$228 billion in further tax reforms. We account for the tax cut, the tax reforms, that this House passed last week by a vote of 244-185 to extend 2001 and 2003 tax relief and preventing automatic tax increases from taking place.

That bill was signed into law today by the President, again preventing tax increases from coming on the backs of the American people. Those provisions included alternative minimum tax relief, that insidious tax that was proffered under Chairman Rostenkowski's reign at the Ways and Means Committee under Democratic rule, that is now taking into its arms, grasping within its reach millions of middle-class Americans who unknowingly are being swept into a net of higher taxation; House-passed pension bill; and other tax relief.

The continuation of these successful economic policies is generating record revenue levels for the Federal Government without increasing taxes. In other words, a strong and growing economy is bringing additional revenue into the Federal Government as a result of enhanced economic activity brought about by lower tax barriers.

While working to give Americans back some of their hard-earned dollars, we also enact a responsible spending plan that exercises control and restraint. I am proud that once again this House has delivered a budget that practices conscientious spending. Our goal is to stem the ever-expanding outflow of Federal dollars.

We hold nonsecurity discretionary spending to a near freeze and create mandatory savings, mandatory being that portion of the budget which now makes up over 55 percent of Federal spending. It is essentially on automatic pilot, and if it is not brought under control, it will consume two-thirds of Federal spending within the decade.

We bring about mandatory savings of nearly \$7 billion over 5 years. Together

these policies, the policies of economic stimulation and fiscal restraint, will reduce the deficit by more than half, from the \$521 billion projected in 2004 to under \$200 billion in 2009.

House Concurrent Resolution 376 has an overall discretionary spending level that is equal to the President's budget at \$873 billion.

As is the case with our bifurcated budgeting and appropriations process, the discretion lies with the House Appropriations Committee to determine the final allocation of these funds.

This budget essentially freezes nonsecurity discretionary spending with only a .1 percent increase over last year's level, and as an additional savings method, this budget caps the advance appropriations.

In the area of mandatory spending, we provide a total of \$1.5 trillion in entitlement spending. In an effort to control this automatic outflow of Federal dollars, the budget resolution calls for mandatory spending reforms from a number of different committees, allowing regular order to reign, along the authorizing committees, to find the proper waste, fraud, duplication and inefficiencies using their own expertise in the various subject matters. These savings total \$6.75 billion over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this year the Budget Committee included an emergency reserve fund to help Congress plan for unforeseen costs that arise in the future. Every year somewhere in America there is an earthquake or a flood, or a hurricane, or a wildfire, or a drought, or a massive snowstorm that requires Federal spending that was unforeseen.

But the fact that it happens every year means that we ought to be able to foresee that something bad is going to happen. We may not know exactly what it will be, it may not rise to the level of Katrina in scale and scope, and, heaven help us, we hope that it does not, but we know that emergencies will arise.

This budget plans for those emergencies, and we set aside in addition \$50 billion toward what we anticipate will be a wartime supplemental request, and again set aside nearly \$6.5 billion for other emergencies stemming from natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work of this Budget Committee, Chairman NUSSLE, Ranking Member SPRATT, for pushing forward a budget that has fiscal discipline, restraint. It incorporates real reforms on the mandatory side as well as providing for the tools that allow this economy to continue to grow and strengthen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we waited months for this? The fact is what we have before us is a sham. What the Republicans have come up with is essentially a shell game. Under this so-called grand compromise, moderate Republicans can increase spending on domestic programs, but only if they cut other domestic priorities.

In other words, if you want more money for children's immunizations or more money for No Child Left Behind, you have to cut funding for Medicaid or further cut student aid. This is the classic definition of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

So to the moderates, let me say after all of us, you have got some words, but in reality you have got nothing. Do not be a cheap date. The responsibility is to the people of this country to make sure that their needs are met, not to saving face. Heaven forbid that the richest in this country do not get their capital gains tax cuts so that we can adequately fund health care and veterans benefits and education.

No, those precious tax cuts are protected. So tonight the crowd on Wall Street can have champagne and caviar at Tavern on the Green while the people who work on Main Street are scratching their heads with disbelief and asking why has their government forgotten them?

The misplaced priorities demonstrated in this budget are astounding. Last month we had a debate on the first rule for the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution. My friends on the other side of the aisle laid out their plans and did their best to defend their priorities.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, their plans are misguided, and their priorities are out of step with the American people. This is a major reason why it has taken weeks and weeks for the Republican leadership to try to jam their budget through this House. Under the Republican budget, our Nation's deficits get worse, not better.

Remember, under Republican policies, the 5 largest deficits in the history of the United States of America will have occurred in 5 consecutive years.

Further, this budget provides only \$50 billion for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I cannot figure out if they have forgotten about these wars or somehow stumbled onto an exit strategy. The truth is that we know the administration will request hundreds of billions of dollars for these wars in the next few years, but this budget makes no mention of that.

Under the Republican budget, up is down, down is up, and the war we see every day is not really happening. The Republicans once again underfund port security, despite their rhetoric of the Dubai Ports deal. Recently the Republicans followed the Democrats' lead and opposed President Bush's approval of the United Arab Emirates control of American ports.

□ 1800

But when faced with the opportunity to follow through on their rhetoric,

they decided to cut port security by over \$6 billion over the next 5 years.

Under this budget resolution, the Republicans make \$228 billion available for new tax cuts, but in the process cut important education, health, and environmental programs.

Cutting these programs for tax cuts is deplorable. Deceiving the American people about future funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is flat wrong. But the most egregious thing about this budget is the way it disrespects our veterans.

My friend from Florida is fond of saying that facts are a stubborn thing. Indeed they are, and here are just a few facts:

According to the Department of Defense, there are almost 297,000 troops currently stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since 2003, the beginning of the war in Iraq, more than 1.2 million troops have served in Iraq and Afghanistan. These are troops that are most likely to need the services of the Veterans Affairs health care systems. These are the troops that will need the most help from this Congress. The costs of their treatment are substantial, yet the Republican budget actually cuts the funding that supports the veterans health care systems. The truth is there are two parts of the veterans funding in this budget, mandatory funding that is guaranteed to be there, and discretionary funding that is subject to appropriations. When mandatory funding is subtracted from the overall funding level, the truth is revealed; and the truth is that after fiscal year 2007 the amount of funding for veterans decreases by \$4 billion. The administration claims they can live with these decreases because the number of veterans will decrease over the next few years. Well, the truth is that there was a 21 percent increase in the number of Iraq war veterans using the VA health care system in the first 3 months of 2006 alone. As of March 14, 2006, the VA had already treated 144,426 veterans, 33,858 more than the administration projected would use the VA system over the entire year.

The administration projected that it would treat 18,000 veterans from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars for post-traumatic stress disorder for fiscal year 2006, but as of March 14, 2006, VA data shows that it is already treating 20,638 veterans for PTSD, an increase of 2,638 before the middle of March.

How then with good conscience can they claim that the number of veterans needing care through the VA health systems will go down in the future? This is either dangerously naive or deliberately misleading. And the claim that the VA could get by with reduced funding would be laughable if it didn't have such serious ramifications.

Just look at what happened last year. The Republican leadership in the House provided \$1.5 billion less than what the veterans services organizations recommended for the VA. For months we were told by the Repub-

licans that, don't worry, everything will be fine. But finally in November the leadership finally relented and provided the amount needed to provide care for our veterans because they saw what was going on.

Well, it is *deja vu* all over again. The Republicans are calling for cuts to the VA system, but we all know we are going to need to provide more funding to meet the demand of the current soldiers who will be the veterans of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have alternatives. We have a plan that is simple. Besides reducing the deficit, reinstating the pay-as-you-go-system, and properly funding education, health care, and homeland security, we give the veterans the services and respect that they deserve. Our budget provides \$6 billion more than the Republican budget does for veterans health care.

My Republican friends charge the Democrats believe enough is never enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to America's veterans, I strongly believe that enough is enough only when veterans have timely access to quality health care that they were promised. I believe enough is enough only when our veterans are not forced to wait 6 months for a doctor's appointment. I believe enough is enough only when our veterans and our veterans' families are cared for with the utmost respect and are not short-changed. We can and we must do better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, obviously this is one of the most important debates of the year as it lays out the blueprint, the outline for Federal priorities. Where we place our priorities is generally where we allocate funding, and the Republican budget divides those priorities between creating incentives for people to continue to grow their businesses, to create an atmosphere of record low unemployment which we enjoy in this country today of 4.8 percent, creating incentives for people to purchase a new piece of equipment, add a new assembly line, add a new store, take on a new employee, fiscal restraint to go along with that economic growth.

Fiscal restraint on the discretionary side where there is a near freeze in discretionary spending, and on the mandatory side which is gobbling up the budget at a record rate, where we for the second year in a row, something that is unprecedented in modern budgeting history, for the second year in a row are looking for savings on that mandatory side of the ledger that so many previous Congresses have been afraid to touch, and bringing about important reforms so that people have confidence in where their hard-earned tax dollars are going.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my friend from Massachusetts has a number of speakers, and I will reserve the balance of my time and look forward to a thorough vetting of this important issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, every justification of the budget we have heard today presents it as a noble and responsible attempt to respond to the harsh economic realities facing our Nation and our people. But when we examine it objectively, we can't avoid seeing the reality behind the pretense.

The bill is designed to do everything it can to protect the record tax cuts for the richest of Americans. For the majority, that is more important than educating our children or providing health care to the veterans or helping Americans raise themselves out of poverty, or even protecting our country from the consequences of either national disasters or mounting national debt.

The authors and supporters of the legislation will tell us that if we wish to avoid increasing our national deficit, which they have already driven to unprecedented heights, we have no choice but to spend on the programs that Americans rely on the most while they are busily cutting out the revenues that come into the government.

But, once again, they are offering a false choice. For 5 years they have forced the massive tax cuts through the Congress. Last week they made the most recent down payment on the cuts. One was \$70 billion. While President Bush signs that bill into law today, Republicans are asking us to pass this bill which adds another \$158 billion to those cuts. So in 2 weeks, we have made those massive cuts, and any justification melts away when we realize who is benefiting from it. They are not for the poor, they are not for the working class, they are not for the middle class. They are for the oil companies. They won't spur our economy or help the average person afford their morning drive to work. They are instead the cuts for billionaires and millionaires, pure and simple. They are not going to help the economy, but they will indeed help people who don't need it, and that assistance will come at the expense of everyone else.

But as always the case, despite objections not just from Democrats but much of the American public, reducing or extending these cuts isn't even on the table here. It never is. They are considered too sacred to touch. And just tonight in the Rules Committee, once again, we turned down an opportunity to pay for more by taking away part of their tax cut.

What do we get in exchange for this giveaway? Well, the majority offered us a budget that will cut domestic spending between 1 and 2 percent every year. As a result, the party that tells us to support the troops is cutting veterans health care by \$6 billion. And we worry and fear for the over 20,000 young

soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been grievously life-altering wounded will not be able to get the care they need when they come back.

Republicans who promised to leave no child behind will be cutting education funding by \$45.3 billion, and the budget of the Department of Education by \$2.2 billion.

Now, not content to make education less rewarding in the present, they apparently want to make our students worry more about loan payments in the future. The bill eliminates all mandatory spending on student loans, leaving congressional appropriators to somehow find \$600 million to meet the students' needs.

The majority wants to cut environmental protection efforts by \$25 billion, and take over \$1 billion from community development and social service initiatives which we desperately need.

The poorest of the poor won't find any relief at all in this legislation. In fact, they will find the opposite. The budget will underfund housing and child care assistance by \$447 million over the next year, and over 5 years the funding for them will fall almost \$15 billion short.

What will the results be? Well, consider the fate of the commodity supplemental food program which provides nutritious meals to 420,000 low-income elderly and 50,000 mothers and children at a cost of \$111 million a year. The budget eliminates it entirely.

Mr. Speaker, it may make sense that they are forcing the cuts through Congress so they can afford the hand-outs to the rich, but perhaps that really is what today's Republican Party stands for. But apparently they also stand for something new, contrary to their rhetoric: irresponsible government spending. The legislation before us will increase our deficit without a vote by \$410 billion over the next 5 years. At the same time, it increases the debt limit by over \$650 billion. By 2011, the limit will stand at \$9.6 trillion.

When the Clinton administration left office, the debt limit was about \$4.5 trillion, and they left us the greatest surplus we have ever had. The majority claims the bill will make us more fiscally secure, but what they really do is sow the seeds of greater insecurity both now and for years to come. When we realize that it isn't necessity driving this bill, but rather a world view that puts the richest Americans ahead of everybody else, we are not left with much else to say but "shame."

We don't share these values. Democrats believe instead, as did that great Republican President Theodore Roosevelt and countless other Americans, that investing in the middle class, which is disappearing quickly, and guaranteeing broad prosperity is the surest way to ensure sustained economic growth.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman raised the issue of education funding. I would point out that the facts are a bit counter to her assertion.

Take special education, something that has long been a priority of both sides of the aisle. Special education funding goes up for the sixth consecutive year, an increase of \$100 million this year, which is an estimated \$1,500 per student, reaching almost 7 million students who have special needs.

On Pell Grants, the budget provides \$12.7 billion in available Pell Grant aid, for an average grant of nearly \$2,500. More than 5.2 million students would be eligible for these grants, an increase of 60,000 students over the previous year.

Title I, those schools that serve the most in need, the resolution provides nearly \$13 billion for title I grants to help schools in the high poverty communities move ahead with No Child Left Behind; \$1 billion for the Reading First program, and increased funding for charter schools, magnet schools, voluntary public school choice, all substantial funding for these very important programs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today's time line reveals everything about the programs and the politics of the majority running this Congress. This afternoon they gathered at the White House. The President signed at a time of staggering deficits yet another tax cut skewed to help the most affluent while doing little to help those who needed help.

This evening in the middle of this debate, they are going to recess so they can go to a big fund-raising party and reap the special interest contributions of those who have benefited so much from their cash-and-carry government. And after that, they are going to come back to the floor of this House and vote to raise the national debt as part of this budget. That is right, raise the national debt as part of this budget.

I haven't heard Mr. PUTNAM say anything about the language in here that raises the national debt \$653 billion. It was buried on the bottom of page 121 of their budget.

It is a mere 2 months since they last raised it. They raised the national debt in March, they pass the tax cut, they have a fund-raiser, and they come back to the floor of the House to raise the national debt again. In fact, it is the fifth time under this President that they have raised the national debt: June 2002, May 2003, November 2004, March 2006, May 2006. And do you know what? They are planning to raise it again once the election is over.

□ 1815

If there is any further clearer evidence that we have a totally irresponsible majority running this country into a fiscal ditch, that is requiring unending borrowing which will saddle

our children with a legacy of debt, I do not know what could more perfectly illustrate it than the events unfolding today.

Sign a tax cut, have a fund-raiser, raise the national debt again: That is the fiscal record of this majority. That is why this budget must be defeated.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to observe a surrender. Once again, our moderate Republican colleagues will hand over their tin swords to the Republican leadership. They are very predictable, and they are my friends, and it is nice to have predictable friends. On every important issue, the moderate Republicans have an unfailing three-step approach to the issue: ineffectual protests, abject surrender, and denial.

Now, they told us for a long time that this budget did not have enough funding for important domestic programs. Indeed, as part of this rule, we have what is called a self-executing rule, which adopts a resolution to mollify the consciences of the Republican moderates. Those are easily mollified.

My colleague from Massachusetts said the gentleman from Florida said facts are stubborn things. Facts are very different from the moderate Republicans. They are the very opposite of stubborn things. They are among the most pliable thing known to man or woman.

So they have a resolution which says, in the summary, it recognizes the need to increase the President's Labor-HHS appropriation by not less than \$7 billion. It recognizes it. It does not do it. It just recognizes it, and on the basis of being able to recognize what they claim is a defect, they are going to vote for this, and that is the deal that is made. Now, I would have liked to have debated their resolution, but it is self-executing.

People watching, I know we are not supposed to refer to them, but we do not address them directly, but we can explain things to them. It gets a little complicated. People might wonder what do we mean by a self-executing resolution. In this case, it allows the moderate Republicans to execute their own moral principles. That is what is self-executing. It allows them to come forward and say, we wish we had more money for poor people, and we have a resolution that says there is not enough money for poor people, and we will vote for that budget that does not have enough money for poor people because we said it does not have enough money. On that, some people consider themselves to have shown independence.

If that was the spirit of independence that motivated this country 250 years ago, that would be the British flag up there and the representative of the Crown. So I hope we defeat this sham,

and maybe the moderate Republicans will grow some spines.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has had some very harsh words for some Members of this body. I would query the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he would agree, how much is enough spending for the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUTNAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, well, I will say this. I would say enough would be what the moderate Republicans said, \$7 billion more for Labor-HHS. The problem is that they said that was enough, but it is not there. So I would be satisfied if my moderate Republican friends simply lived up to their own declaration.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this negotiation, this process that yields this budget, recognizes that we have a number of challenges at this point in time, and all points of view recognize that we have to create an environment, a climate for economic growth and strength, and we have to have fiscal restraint.

There is not a blank checkbook, as some, perhaps some from Massachusetts or other parts, might suggest where it is just an ongoing, empty, bottomless pit of spending. You have to be responsible about the taxpayers' money. You have to draw lines around it and prioritize, and we have done that in this budget.

In the minority, you have the luxury of not having to rally behind any one particular proposal. In fact, that is why there are two different substitutes offered that offer at least two very different viewpoints from your own caucus.

We have the obligation, we have the responsibility to actually move a product that changes lives. We have the responsibility to actually pass a budget that implements spending controls on an over \$2 trillion Federal budget and put us on a path to cutting the deficit while still securing a climate that allows economic growth and prosperity to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) 30 seconds so he can respond.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, again, I was simply quoting the moderate Republicans, for one thing.

Secondly, that claim for responsibility and this assumption that they would get the job done would be more impressive if we thought that they in the Senate were going to agree to something.

So, in fact, we had a problem earlier this year where bills passed in somewhat different form in the House and

the Senate were signed into law despite the Constitution, and we now know why, because whether it is lobbying and ethics reform or the budget or immigration, the Republican House and the Republican Senate cannot get together.

I will have to say to the gentleman from Florida that beating of your chest and talking about how responsive you are as to beat the moderates into submission would be more impressive if I thought you had any chance of getting an actual budget signed by the Senate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for weeks we have been wondering whether the Republican moderates were going to stick to their guns when they said they knew that it was wrong to pass a budget that provided \$40 billion in tax cuts for people making \$1 million a year while you are squeezing the guts out of education and health programs. We now know the answer. They are doing a poor imitation of Bert Lahr, the Cowardly Lion in "The Wizard of Oz." I wish Bert were here. He would cry at their performance.

The fact is they are now selling out for a promise that if sometime in the deep, dark, distant future somebody does something to change this budget resolution, then there might be a table scrap or two left for additional education and health care. There is about as much chance of that happening as there is of the Chicago Cubs winning the pennant this year.

With respect to what the gentleman from Florida said on education, the fact is the Congress promised the States that on special education we would pay for 40 percent of the costs. Each year for the last 3 years, the Federal share of the cost of special education has been cut by budgets that you have voted for.

You talk about Pell Grants. The fact is it costs \$3,400 more to go to a 4-year public college today than it did 5 years ago. The President wanted to solve that by adding \$100 to the Pell Grant program. House Republicans said, no, that was too much. You cut it to \$50, and then when you sent it to the Senate, you cut out the rest of the 50 bucks.

So, in 5 years you have not done one whit to make it easier for people to go to college by increasing the Pell Grants.

So do not give us your crocodile tears, and do not brag incidentally about how much you have increased education for the last 6 years, because there are \$16 billion in the education budget today that would not be there if we had not dragged you kicking and screaming into supporting Labor-Health budgets that in the end were higher than the original House Republican budget.

So I do not mind if the gentleman wants to live in the Land of Oz. Just do not take us there with you.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is becoming more and more clear that there is never enough spending, although we will undoubtedly hear from speakers later in the evening who will talk about how they would have fiscal restraint over here, more spending over here, more spending over here and more fiscal restraint over here. They have that luxury being in the minority.

But the bottom line is education funding has gone up year after year after year. Special education funding is at record levels, far higher than it was when the other team was in charge.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), my good friend from the Budget Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and indeed, it does beg the question, how much Federal spending is enough?

I am reminded yet again that people are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts, and, Mr. Speaker, maybe we ought to get a few of the facts on the table. Let us just take a look in our rearview mirror over the last 10 years and see how much money the Federal Government has been spending.

International affairs is up 89.1 percent; natural resources and environment, 43.8 percent; commerce and housing credit, 28.4. Since we have been discussing education training and employment, in 10 years that budget has gone from \$53 billion to \$114 billion. That is an increase of 113 percent. I mean, Mr. Speaker, how much do we need here in Federal spending? Should it be a 130 percent increase in 10 years, 150, 200?

We have to remember, also, Mr. Speaker, where is this money coming from? Although maybe there is literally a printing press down the road, figuratively there is not one. All of this money is coming from some American family, and every time we are increasing some Federal program, we are taking it away from some family program. Right now, again, budgets are about values, and they are about dollars and cents, and ultimately, this debate does come down again to taxes and spending.

The Democrats have said that we are offering all these great tax cuts. I looked very closely in the budget. I am having a little trouble finding that. What I do find is that we are going to prevent a huge automatic tax increase engineered by the other side. It is very fascinating to me in the Federal city how spending is forever; yet tax relief seems to be temporary.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decry any of the tax relief that has occurred under President Bush's watch. So that means they want to take it away. Well, what does that mean? It means, well, the lowest-income taxpayers will see that their taxes are increased 50 percent. It means we lose the 10 percent bracket.

We go to the 15 percent bracket, a 50 percent increase on our lowest-income taxpayers.

Married taxpayers will see the marriage penalty return if they have their way and have their huge automatic tax increases. Taxpayers with children will lose 50 percent of their child tax credits. Taxes on dividends and capital gains could jump as much as 100 percent.

Again, you start to think, well, wait a second, where is all this money coming from? Well, it is coming from families. It is coming from small business.

So how do families all across America afford to send their children to college? How about their education programs? Already, Mr. Speaker, we are now spending over \$22,000 per American household. Last year was the first time since World War II that we have reached that level of spending. All that spending has got to be paid for. It has got to be paid for. It has got to be paid for by American families.

Now, again, our friends on the other side of the aisle want to decry all of the tax relief and say that somehow it is the root cause of the deficit, the increase in the national debt. Well, again, they are entitled to their own opinions. They are not entitled to their own facts.

I happen to have in my hand the latest report from the Treasury statement on revenues, which I would be happy to share with any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that says, guess what, we have more tax revenue. We have more tax receipts. Last year tax receipts increased roughly 15 percent. This year we are on track to have tax revenues increase about 11 percent.

Guess what? Since we have allowed American families and small business to keep more of what they earn, they have gone out and they have created jobs, and people pay taxes, and all of the sudden we have more tax revenues. It is kind of hard to make the argument that somehow tax relief that created 5 million new jobs has somehow added to the national debt. Clearly we have a large challenge with our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I would say it is not because the American people are undertaxed. In fact, I am surprised that our friends on the other side of the aisle are not applauding the President for really presiding over one of the largest tax increases in American history. Here it is right here. We are awash in new revenue, but we did it the right way, Mr. Speaker. We grew the economy. We created jobs.

Now, what happens if you start to take the tax relief away? Well, again, since we have had tax relief, 5 million new jobs have been created. We have the highest rate of homeownership in the entire history of the United States of America, and yet, if you start to take away the tax relief, if you have these automatic tax increases, you lose the jobs. That is just wrong, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1830

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to just respond to the gentleman.

When President Bush came to office, we had a debt of \$5.6 trillion. By the end of this year, it will be over \$9 trillion. By the end of his term, he will have doubled it. So you have done such a wonderful job driving this country into deep debt that we are going to have to pass it on to our children and our grandchildren.

Pay as you go is what we are saying over here. You are the ones who are behaving fiscally irresponsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues are familiar with the Kenny Rogers song which says you have to know when to hold and know when to fold. I sure would like to be in a poker game with the Republican moderates. They fold before they even see their cards. They got nothing out of this budget deal, and they are going to tell us how wonderfully they did. It is nothing but a promise, and it will be a promise that is not kept.

My colleague from Florida talks about the bottomless pit of spending. Talking about bottomless pits, let us talk about \$8 billion in subsidies to the oil industry. Let us talk about another \$7 billion in a windfall and not having them pay a royalty tax for the oil they take out of the ground. We just waived it for all of them. And they get a prescription drug bill which has nothing but massive subsidies for the pharmaceutical industry and for the insurance industry. That is where the bottomless pit is.

And you have a tax cut bill, \$70 billion, and you cannot find it in your heart to do something for low-income families? I can tell you what people in this country don't know; that if you make \$11,000 or less, you are not eligible for a child tax credit. But we see that some of the wealthiest people in this Nation get one very, very big tax break.

Let us take a look at what happened between last week and this week when the majority failed to muster the votes on the budget. Are we no longer staring down the barrel of a \$2.2 billion in education cuts, \$8.6 billion in cuts to veterans services, and \$18.1 billion in health care costs? That is exactly what we are looking at.

And I will tell you, we could pay for this budget's \$3 billion shortfall in education, health and workforce training programs with that tax cut's \$4.8 billion in breaks that helps corporations like GE and Citicorp increase their profits overseas.

You know, Republicans today are wondering why the American people have lost all faith in their leadership. The goal of the budget ought to be to benefit the common good. That may seem like a novelty to this Republican majority, but the country is crying out for that leadership.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentlewoman, who has apparently not had an opportunity to review the budget, that there is an additional \$3.1 billion reserve fund for domestic priorities; \$3.1 billion additional for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. And in addition to that, we budget for emergencies. We draw lines around the restraint that is necessary to keep the deficit on a path to be cut in half in 5 years. We keep the economy growing.

They rail against the \$70 billion that were involved in tax reconciliation that prevents taxes from going up today, yet their own budget has \$150 billion. Which is it? They talk about not having enough money in our side of the budget, and yet they rail about the deficit.

You can't have it both ways. Well, I guess you can if you are on the floor of the House arguing against a responsible budget plan.

This bill lays out a responsible roadmap towards shrinking the deficit, keeping the economy strong and growing, and being able to look constituents in the eye about the levels of spending. It does not open up a bottomless pit of spending, as some would prefer on the other side of the aisle, where enough is never enough. We recognize that trade-offs have to be made in businesses, in families, and in the Federal Government, and it is important that we look at both sides of the ledger, discretionary and mandatory.

The only thing that my friends on the other side of the aisle could find to clap about in the State of the Union Address was our President and our leadership's noble attempt to rein in mandatory spending, something that both parties' think tanks on each side of the ideological spectrum and administrations of each political party have agreed is in desperate need of help. Yet they can only take glee in the fact that they shut down the first real attempt to reform mandatory spending in a generation.

This budget lays out a framework for reform, restraint, and economic growth, and they are trying to have it not just both ways, but three or four or five different ways.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. The gentleman from Florida should not continue to fool the American public. There is no new funding in this bill for health, education and other programs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, May is Foster Care Appreciation Month, when the Nation honors those who open their hearts and homes to Amer-

ica's most vulnerable children. These are children who cannot live at home because it isn't safe.

How ironic and out of touch that the Republican majority should choose May to bring out a budget that neglects America's neglected children by obliterating the funding for the Social Services Block Grant program. This program funds America's response to the SOS of neglected children who need us to protect them.

The Republicans have other priorities: Giving the rich more money. The Republicans believe a safe house for a child is a mansion for the rich, so they will cut \$500 million out of these programs which help the poor in order to give away millions to the rich.

There is no home, no heart and no shame in this Republican budget. They take care of the top 1 percent. They cannot give enough to those people at the top. They cannot borrow enough to give to those people at the top. And they forget about everybody else, including the foster children. That is the American way for the Republicans.

I offered an amendment to change this. They turned it down. Vote "no" on this budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I speak tonight as a cochair of the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of fiscally conservative Democrats, and I speak tonight with some disappointment because I am one in this Chamber who knows how hard it is to put together a budget. It is a tough job that the majority has.

I am sorry that my friends who are moderate Republicans sold out so cheap. And I am even sorrier that my friends who are part of the Republican Study Committee did not get more of what they wished. But it is tough to put together a budget.

In all this blizzard of words and numbers we have been hearing about tonight, there is one central principle that should guide the Members here, at least the ones who are listening and not already at the big Republican fundraiser tonight, and that one central principle that should guide our deliberations is the principle that not only I hold dear, but Alan Greenspan, the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, one of the great financial minds in this country, said was the single most important reform that this House could undertake. And what is that? It is called pay as you go.

We had it in this country from 1990, under the first President Bush, all the way through the second President Bush. We had it for 12 years, from 1990 to 2002, and then the Republican majority let it expire. But Alan Greenspan said it was the single most important thing we could do to regain our fiscal balance, our fiscal sanity. Yet there is no real pay as you go in the Republican budget. There is in the Democratic budget.

That is why on behalf of the Blue Dogs I urge all of our Members who care about Alan Greenspan, who care about pay as you go, who care about fiscal sanity to vote for PAYGO. Because that is the principle that every family back home understands. If you want something, pay for it.

That is what the Democratic budget does, and I am proud to vote for the Democratic budget tonight.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the California Legislature for 24 years, half of which was spent in a leadership role, and I believe I know how to engage in a bipartisan process. Unfortunately this budget resolution is not a bipartisan process.

Rather than provide the House with an opportunity to engage in serious and meaningful budget discussions, we are left with this "take it or leave it" package. Today this body acts in a de facto parliamentary fashion. Rather than consider the constructive and realistic solutions to our budget problems, like the Blue Dog 12-point plan that was referenced by Mr. COOPER, that includes a pay-as-you-go provision, we are left with this proposal as our only option. It is a Hobson's choice, which I believe is no choice at all.

Rather than do what our constituents expect us to do, discuss, debate, and have meaningful oversight, make tough policy choices, we are left with a budget package within a failed budget process that is nothing more than a fig leaf to cover a host of fiscal policy shortcomings that have resulted in massive budget deficits over the last 5 years. It is a chronic case of wanting to have your cake and eat it, too.

We cannot continue to tell the American people they can have tax cuts, increased spending, and not impact our budget deficits, but that is what this budget resolution does. I do not believe that a majority of Americans support this way of doing the people's business. They expect us, as adults, to work together to solve the fiscal problems of our Nation. Unfortunately, that is not what is happening in this effort, and I unfortunately must oppose this budget resolution.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California and the speaker before him from Tennessee made reference to the Blue Dog budget, and, in fact, there was even reference to how difficult it is to produce a budget. Well, apparently it is so difficult they couldn't do it because there is no Blue Dog substitute.

I tip my hat to the Progressive Caucus. They managed to produce a budget that we will debate on this floor. It is an alternative view of where this Nation ought to be headed. I don't agree

with it, but they made the tough decisions to put it together, embody it in an amendment, and put it to debate on this floor. I tip my hat to Mr. SPRATT, the distinguished ranking member of the committee. They have a substitute amendment.

The Blue Dogs are all bark and no bite. No budget substitute was offered. Apparently putting together a budget that met their own internal divisions proved too difficult in the end.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise and urge the defeat of this previous question.

It should come as no surprise to anyone in this country that Democrats and Republicans differ in their priorities for America. With the White House set to vote on the budget tonight, I as a Blue Dog oppose the majority party's misguided plan which will result in a staggering \$10 trillion deficit by the year 2010.

The Blue Dog 12-step reform plan is a comprehensive, responsible alternative to the meager attempt to reform and contain the Republican budget. The Blue Dog plan is based on a commitment to resolving the fiscal problems facing our country that includes a call for a balanced budget, strict spending plan, and a pay-as-you-go rule, especially establishing a rainy day justification.

The budget resolution debated tonight will cut critical programs in order to pay for millionaire tax cuts, cuts to food stamps, the WIC program, the school lunch program, the breakfast program, student financial assistance, Community Development Block Grants, veterans health care, and funding to help local law enforcement, to name a few.

I ask our colleagues to defeat this budget. We need to help those poor and disadvantaged, our veterans, our health block grants, and students who need an education.

Mr. PUTNAM. I would ask the gentleman where the Blue Dog budget is? Where is the Blue Dog substitute amendment? We are looking for it. We can't find it. There is no Blue Dog substitute amendment. It is back on the porch. It is in the pound. It is in the kennel. I don't know where it is.

There is a progressive substitute. There is a Spratt substitute. There is no Blue Dog substitute.

Mr. BACA. There is a pay as you go.

Mr. PUTNAM. There is not a Blue Dog substitute.

Mr. BACA. Then you should look at the pay-as-you-go plan. You know that? It is there.

Mr. PUTNAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. PUTNAM. There have been three references to a Blue Dog substitute

that is mythical. It is as mythical as the \$727 billion tax gap, Wizard of Oz smoke and mirrors that is in one of the other substitutes. It is as mythical as the numbers that they use to pay for their increased spending.

There is no such thing. There is not a substitute amendment.

Mr. BACA. That is why we are supporting the Democratic substitute amendment, and that is pay as you go. The Democratic substitute budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PUTNAM. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty clear we made our point.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1845

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I would be happier if Americans are watching this debate, or if they are not watching the debate. I am an auctioneer and it sounds almost like an auction: no matter how much we spend it is not enough. But here is something I think all Members need to be aware of. Next year the taxpayers are going to generously provide this Congress and this Federal Government with a 12 percent increase in revenue. Over the next 5 years, the estimate is it will be at least an increase averaging 5.4 percent per year. Now that is at a time when we expect the inflation rate will be somewhere less than 3 percent. In other words, revenue to the Federal Government will be almost double what we project the inflation rate to be.

And Americans watching at home are asking a simple question: Why can't you live within your means? And that is what this budget is about. That is what this debate is about. And I think Americans watching at home must be wondering, how in the world, why is it with a 12 percent increase next year and a 5½ percent increase averaging over the next 5 years, why can't you figure it out to live within your means?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. NUSSLE. This is his sixth year chairing the Budget Committee. As I think most of my colleagues know, it has been six tough years, and Mr. NUSSLE has done a very, very good job in bringing us to this point. And I want to congratulate him and wish him well as he decides to leave the House and to pursue other political interests in the State of Iowa.

I think all of us know that we have been through a long, arduous process

to bring this budget to the floor tonight. It has been months of conversations with Members, not always easy; certainly it has been very difficult. But the process has allowed us to better understand each other, understand our needs, and understand the needs of the American people.

As one of my colleagues earlier was pointing out, revenues to the Federal Government grew last year at over 11 percent. Revenues to the Federal Government this year are going to grow at over 12 percent, which really, I think, speaks volumes, that lowering tax rates does not necessarily mean lower revenues to the Federal Government.

If you look at what we did in the late 1990s when we balanced the budget, it was revenue growing to double digits rates and us holding the line on spending. And I know there is a lot of well-meaning, well-intentioned spending that people would like. But we can't continue to spend our kids' and their kids' inheritance every year, which has gone on here far too long. And if you look at what we are doing here, with revenues rising and holding the line on spending, we can, in fact, balance the budget in the next 4 or 5 years. It is very possible. And so I want to thank all of my colleagues for working with us to get to this point.

I want to yield to my colleague from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding to me, and I would just like to go through with him and for the edification of those who may not be that familiar with it, some of the negotiations that have been going on with respect to this.

First of all, there are those of us who were concerned about the President's budget, Mr. Majority Leader, and we called that to your attention early on. It is a little bit unusual to be dealing with this at budget time because we are basically with one of the appropriations. And I agree with you that the gentleman from Ohio has done a wonderful job on this. I don't always vote for his budgets, but he has certainly done a wonderful job dealing with this over the years.

But in this particular circumstance, what came down from the President was not satisfactory to some of us, and so I prepared an amendment to increase the Labor HHS Education allocation by \$7.158 billion. We then entered into the negotiations.

I don't remember any time precedence for that in the time that I have been here which has happened at the level of dealing with a specific allocation when we are dealing with the budget. Basically, we were concerned about health accounts. We wanted them increased by \$1.1 billion, education accounts by 4.6; LIHEAP by 1.3 was the primary focus here. I tried to bring it to 2006 funding plus 2 percent for inflation.

We had negotiations with you, sir; we had negotiations with the chairman of

the Appropriations Committee and other House leaders as well. And let me just thank you very much for that. That has not always been the case, and we are very appreciative of it.

Eventually, a decision was made by the leadership to transfer over \$6 billion which was shifted from defense in foreign operations without raising the cap at all with respect to the 302(a) number and \$4.1 billion of that went to Labor, HHS, Education, which is \$843 million more than was received in 2006.

Obviously, this is an important budget to many of us because we are concerned about what happens at home. This relates to health research, which is vital to all of us I think, to IDEA, to Centers for Disease Control, after-school care, vocational education and the National Institutes of Health, just to name a few. And so we increased it by that particular amount of money.

In further negotiations with Mr. LEWIS and with you, we also established some other areas of concern that would be addressed, that is, community development block grants, the Byrne and COPS grants all would be at the 2006 levels, and the President's competitive initiative would be funded at his requested level. So all this was arranged as a matter of negotiation.

There was actually another billion dollars to homeland security and approximately \$500 million to agriculture and \$500 million to energy and water as part of this.

This is probably not ideal. And I am sure there are those who would get up and say, well, gee, why didn't you get the whole loaf? Well, I frankly don't know of anyone who has ever gotten this kind of change made in the budget after the budget has been introduced in terms of building to that.

And more importantly, we have an assurance from you, for whom I have a great deal of respect and trust, having worked with you and listening to your word on the Education Committee all these years, that this will be done, that we'll eventually get to the \$7.158 billion, that we may get to it before we actually vote on the Labor, HHS, Education bill in the House or perhaps later when it might come out of conference. And that is very important as well. That has been repeated again and again and I think needs to be reiterated here today.

Then that raises the question of if this is an assurance or a sense of Congress, versus real money, which is what it really is when you get right down to it. We have received commitments that that additional \$3 billion will not come from mandatory programs that serve the people we are trying to help, like Medicaid and Medicare, food stamps, foster programs and others. We want to make sure that any offsets are carefully crafted and our group of about 20 people that has been involved with this has no intentions of supporting reductions which would adversely affect the neediest among us who we are trying to help by this. And I think it is very

important that everybody understand that we have had that discussion as well in terms of where we are going as far as the future is concerned. So I would like to thank you for the negotiations.

With that, I do support the budget; and, sure, I would like to have the whole loaf, so to speak, if we could. But I understand why we are not there now, and perhaps there will be other changes actually before we vote on this. I don't know.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague from Delaware for his willingness to work through these long several months. I think you have very accurately portrayed the agreements that we have come to. And it is important to understand that we were able to do this without spending \$1 more than what the President asked for. The \$873 billion, 302(a) discretionary cap remains in effect. But moving the priorities around to meet the needs of our various Members is how we were able to do this. And any additional spending on the Labor, HHS bill at the end of the day is either going to have to be offset or come from other 302(b) accounts.

And the commitment is that we will get there at the end of the day. We will work with Members across the spectrum in terms of how we get there. But the important thing is that we are able to meet the needs of all of our Members without exceeding the President's numbers.

So I want to thank my colleague, tell him how much I have enjoyed working with him and all of the members of our conference. I am just glad that we are here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman who is the ranking member on our Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT.

Mr. SPRATT. I have great respect for the distinguished majority leader, but I have to take exception when he says if we hold the line on spending and let revenues continue, we will balance the budget in 5 years. The deficit this year without offsetting Social Security per this resolution for next year will be \$545 billion. In 5 years, according to this resolution, it will be \$428 billion.

During that same period of time between 2002 and 2011, the debt of the United States will grow to \$11.3 trillion. That is twice its level when President Bush came to office. I don't think we are making the progress that we must make if we are really to get this problem under control.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I am still trying to decipher that colloquy. And it sure looked, smelled and felt like sleight of hand, so chances are it probably was.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the Democratic substitute, mainly for two reasons: because of the values and the priorities that are re-

flected in our budget, but also because of another important reason, and that is the budget disciplinary tool that we have called pay-as-you-go that they refuse to implement in their budget. Pay-as-you-go was something that worked very well in the 1990s, which gave us 4 years of budget surpluses where we were actually paying down the national debt, not becoming more dependent on China to be financing our deficits, which is the fiscal policy that they are pursuing. These are real choices that we have to make and pay-as-you-go is one real choice that is distinguished in the Democratic substitute.

The reason why their numbers don't add up is because there is a complete disconnect between their tax-and-spending policy. It is because too many of them believe in this concept of dynamic scoring which means four minus two equals three, not two. And if any third grader today taking their No Child Left Behind math test submitted an answer, four minus two equals three, they would fail and their school would be labeled as a failing school. And that is the problem with the fiscal policies under the majority today. They are failing the American people by leaving a legacy of debt for our children.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a great deal of respect for my friend from Wisconsin with whom we have worked on the budget. The challenges I see with the Democratic substitute are ones that we have pointed out earlier. They depend upon money that doesn't exist to make their numbers work, a tax gap of \$727 billion that the IRS can't find.

Well, if the IRS can't find it, does the other side know where it is? If we have been looking for it for all this time, but they know where it is to the point that they have budgeted it, \$727 billion to make their numbers work, then they must have some better insight as to where that gap is.

It is smoke and mirrors. The CBO won't even score it. The CBO scores it as a zero revenue raiser. And yet they are depending on it for \$727 billion.

They only allocate \$150 billion in their substitute for tax relief. And yet we have had opportunities on this House floor for half that amount that they have rejected. We had opportunities to prevent the AMT from impacting millions of middle-class Americans. Rejected. Preventing capital gains rates from going up which have allowed revenues to the government to increase, 11, 12 percent. Dividend taxes, preventing those from going up. They have rejected that. But they put \$150 billion in their own substitute, which doesn't even cover the child tax credit, the marriage penalty, the death tax, the whole host of other issues. The numbers don't add up.

Ours is the responsible, comprehensive blueprint. We deal with a freeze, a near freeze on discretionary spending,

non-defense discretionary spending. We deal with the mandatory side of the ledger which is now over half of Federal spending, something that the Blue Dogs claim that they are concerned about, something that fiscal hawks on the other side claim that they are concerned about; and it is nowhere to be found in their substitute.

□ 1900

Ours is the only budget that is comprehensive, responsible, and honest about the challenges that are facing this great land.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of clarification, there is no assumption in our budget resolution about a tax gap, realizing a tax gap. We did use that concept as an offset in the budget markup, but it is not in the budget resolution. There is no assumption to that effect at all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

If the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule to provide that immediately after the House passes this rule, it will take up legislation to restore fiscal responsibility to the congressional budget process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill will do two very important things. First, it will reinstate the pay-as-you-go requirement that was in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act that expired in 2002. The bill will restore the PAYGO provision and extend it through the year 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the budget process may be complicated, but one thing is clear: We should be required to pay for new spending and tax breaks instead of running the highest deficits in the history of our country. The message is simple: If you want more tax breaks for millionaires, then pay for them. Our constituents have to take responsibility for their personal spending and their personal debt. So should we.

In addition, this bill will repeal rule XXVII, the House rule that blocks a direct vote on increasing the Federal debt limit, thereby shielding Members of this House from any responsibility for the massive rise in the debt ceiling. Under this rule, simply passing the budget effectively triggers an automatic increase in the debt ceiling. Members never have to get their hands dirty or explain to their constituents why our national debt continues to skyrocket to numbers that are so massive that they are almost impossible to

comprehend. They never have to take a position or provide a reason. They can just pretend that it happened without any way to stop it. And to make this even worse, it only happens in the House. The Senate will still vote for the debt limit increase directly.

This Republican budget resolution calls for yet another increase in the debt limit by \$653 billion, bringing our total debt limit to \$9.6 trillion. Democrats believe that we should repeal House rule XXVII and require a straight up-or-down vote on raising the Federal debt limit.

I say to my colleagues, take responsibility. Show some backbone. Have some courage and explain to the American people why you are driving this country into debt.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make two clarifications. One, to my friend from Massachusetts, I would clarify that the rule he seeks to repeal is commonly known as the Gephardt rule. Secondly, I would clarify the clarification made by my friend Mr. SPRATT that on page 51, lines 13 through 19 of the legislation known as the Spratt amendment, there is tax relief that is provided; the additional revenue loss is offset such as through the recovery of a portion of unpaid revenue, commonly known as the tax gap, which we referred to. So that is a portion of their amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUTNAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, the so-called Gephardt rule expired, and then it was reinstated by the Republican majority; so it is now the Hastert rule.

Mr. PUTNAM. We like to give credit where credit is due, and being big fans of intellectual property rights, since we protect intellectual property, the real creative genius in that belongs to Mr. Gephardt.

To my friend from Massachusetts, we have had a speaker come in since I said to you that I had no further speakers, and I would inquire as to whether you objected to allowing him to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, I would not object.

Mr. PUTNAM. Very well.

I would yield 2 minutes to my friend from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank my friend from Massachusetts as well.

I have to say I just got in on the tail end of this, but I wanted to come down and say I think that allowing these budgets to be discussed tonight is a good thing. The Democrats will have two budgets that they are offering. The Republicans will have one, and we had the other one; so I guess it is two to

two. I know we would have 435 individual budgets if everybody could have something that they fully believed in. But, unfortunately, in a large body of 435 people where you have to have 218 votes or at least a plurality to get something done, you have got to leave behind some budgets.

And I think this is going to give us a night of some good debates. We will be able to discuss priorities, both priorities in spending and priorities in cutting and reducing and changing the face of government.

I want to point out that last year, and Mr. PUTNAM may remember, but I believe we passed the budget finally, and Mr. SPRATT might know, 214-212, which somewhat shows the precarious position of a dynamic body, that if you moved spending up a little bit, you would not have been able to pass it. If you reduced it a little bit, you would not have been able to pass it.

So in this large institution we had a budget that just was balanced as we could get it, and I think we are probably going to be heading in that direction again. And I do not think that is a bad thing. I think all this debating is good, and that our arguments that we will have tonight in a friendly spirit will also carry on to each of the 11 appropriation bills, I guess these days, 10 subcommittees, but these things will be carried on, and we will see them again and again in committee and subcommittee form.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 517, RULE FOR H. CON. RES. 376—THE FY07 CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

"SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a bill consisting of the text specified in Section 4. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

"SEC. 4. The text referred to in section 3 is as follows:"

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Restoring Fiscal Responsibility to the Congressional Budget Process Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO REQUIREMENT.

(a) SECTION 252 AMENDMENTS.—Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking "2002" both places it appears and inserting "2011".

(b) SECTION 275 AMENDMENT.—Section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking "2006" and inserting "2015".

SEC. 3. VOTING TO CHANGE THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

The Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by repealing rule XXVII and by redesignating rule XXVIII as rule XXVII.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution * * * [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule * * * When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Descher's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 8 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 376, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 817 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.
Akin	Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.
Alexander	Burgess	Doolittle
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Drake
Baker	Buyer	Dreier
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Duncan
Bartlett (MD)	Camp (MI)	Ehlers
Barton (TX)	Campbell (CA)	Emerson
Bass	Cantor	English (PA)
Beauprez	Capito	Everett
Biggert	Carter	Feeney
Bilirakis	Castle	Ferguson
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Blackburn	Chocola	Flake
Blunt	Cole (OK)	Foley
Boehlert	Conaway	Forbes
Boehner	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Bonilla	Cubin	Fossella
Bonner	Culberson	Fox
Bono	Davis (KY)	Franks (AZ)
Boozman	Davis, Jo Ann	Frelinghuysen
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Gallegly
Bradley (NH)	Deal (GA)	Garrett (NJ)
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Gerlach
Brown (SC)	Dent	Gibbons

Gilchrest	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Gillmor	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Gingrey	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (MI)
Gohmert	E.	Rohrabacher
Goode	Mack	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Royce
Granger	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Graves	McCaul (TX)	Ryun (KS)
Green (WI)	McCotter	Saxton
Gutknecht	McCrery	Schmidt
Hall	McHenry	Schwarz (MI)
Harris	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Hart	McKeon	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Shadegg
Hayes	Mica	Shaw
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Sha's
Hefley	Miller (MI)	Sherwood
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Herger	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Hobson	Murphy	Simmons
Hoekstra	Musgrave	Simpson
Hostettler	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Hulshof	Ney	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Northup	Sodrel
Hyde	Norwood	Souder
Inglis (SC)	Nunes	Stearns
Issa	Nussle	Sullivan
Istook	Osborne	Sweeney
Jenkins	Otter	Tancred
Jindal	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (CT)	Paul	Terry
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Thomas
Johnson, Sam	Pence	Thornberry
Keller	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
Kelly	Petri	Turner
Kennedy (MN)	Pickering	Upton
King (IA)	Pitts	Waldeen (OR)
King (NY)	Platts	Walsh
Kingston	Poe	Wamp
Kirk	Pombo	Weldon (FL)
Kline	Porter	Weldon (PA)
Knollenberg	Price (GA)	Weller
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Westmoreland
Kuhl (NY)	Putnam	Whitfield
LaHood	Radanovich	Wicker
Latham	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)
LaTourette	Regula	Wilson (SC)
Leach	Rehberg	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Young (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Renzi	
Linder	Reynolds	

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Kind
Allen	DeFazio	Kucinich
Andrews	DeGette	Langevin
Baca	Delahunt	Lantos
Baird	DeLauro	Larsen (WA)
Baldwin	Dicks	Lee
Barrow	Dingell	Levin
Bean	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Doyle	Lipinski
Berkley	Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe
Berman	Emanuel	Lowey
Berry	Engel	Lynch
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Maloney
Bishop (NY)	Etheridge	Markley
Blumenauer	Farr	Marshall
Boren	Fattah	Matheson
Boswell	Filner	McCarthy
Boucher	Ford	McCollum (MN)
Boyd	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	McGovern
Brown (OH)	Gordon	McIntyre
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McKinney
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McNulty
Capps	Grijalva	Meehan
Capuano	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Cardoza	Herseth	Melancon
Carnahan	Higgins	Michaud
Carson	Hinchey	Millender-
Case	Holden	McDonald
Chandler	Holt	Miller (NC)
Clay	Honda	Miller, George
Cleaver	Hooley	Mollohan
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Conyers	Inslie	Moore (WI)
Cooper	Israel	Moran (VA)
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
Cramer	(TX)	Neal (MA)
Crowley	Jefferson	Oberstar
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Oliver
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Owens
Davis (FL)	Kildee	